

resolution (H. Res. 174) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1654) to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1553, NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999**

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-148) on the resolution (H. Res. 175) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1553) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 for the National Weather Service, Atmospheric Research, and National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1141, 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT**

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 173 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 173**

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted a rule to provide for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1141, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 173 should not be controversial. It is a nor-

mal conference report rule, allowing for timely consideration of the emergency supplemental bill.

While I suspect that many of us will have strong opinions about the underlying spending bill, let us pass this rule and have the debate on the floor.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague has described, this rule waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 1141, which is the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999.

The measure appropriates \$15 billion for military operations in Kosovo and other defense spending, humanitarian assistance to refugees and misplaced persons in the Balkans, hurricane-related relief in Central America and the Caribbean, aid to the country of Jordan, assistance to U.S. farmers hurt by low commodity prices, tornado victims in Oklahoma, Kansas, and for other purposes.

Most of the spending is considered emergency, and therefore is not offset by spending cuts in other programs.

Mr. Speaker, there is something for everyone in this massive spending bill. If Members like the bill, they can find critical programs that are funded. If they do not like the bill, they can find wasteful spending and harmful cuts.

I am particularly pleased with the refugee relief and humanitarian assistance provided by the measure. The conference agreement includes \$1.1 billion for international assistance programs, refugee resettlement, and State Department funding. This is more than 60 percent above the level approved by the House.

I am grateful to the conferees for including \$149.2 million in food assistance to refugees and misplaced persons in the Balkans through the PL-480 Food for Peace program. Failure to include money for this program was a serious omission, and I am glad that this has been corrected in the conference committee. These funds will ensure America provides its share of the food needed in the Balkans through the end of the year 2000.

Equally important, this change follows the longstanding tradition of providing food aid through the Food for Peace program, which is an established channel that benefits America's farmers. This program has proven to be the most effective way to provide the large quantities of food essential to any relief effort.

Including funding for PL-480 food aid is an example of bipartisan leadership at its best, and I am particularly grateful to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the gentleman from Alabama

(Mr. CALLAHAN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The measure also includes \$2.2 billion for enhancing military operations and maintenance, and this will improve the readiness of our armed services.

I am concerned about some of the offsets for nonemergency spending. The offsets include cuts in food stamps and Section 8 housing for low-income individuals. Also, I regret that the conferees rejected a Senate proposal to include funding to pay the money the U.S. owes to the United Nations for back dues. I think it is a disgrace that our Nation has not paid our debt to the U.N., and this bill would have been a good vehicle to include that payment.

On the whole, the conference report represents a good compromise, and I say that in a good way. It is much better than the House-passed version, and I intend to support it. Though the measure under consideration is by no means ordinary, this is the standard rule for conference reports.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this supplemental appropriations conference report contains critically needed resources for our armed forces to assure that they continue unchallenged as the finest fighting force in the world for the protection of the people and the freedom of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report, among other things, contains aid for America's farmers, and it contains humanitarian and development assistance for our neighbors in Central America who suffered the recent natural disaster known as Hurricane Mitch.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this Congress today makes a clear demonstration of solidarity with and concern for the well-being of our friends and neighbors in Central America.

I wish at this point to thank all of those who have worked to make this a reality, especially the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), the gentleman from Florida (Chairman BILL YOUNG), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and all of the congressional leaders who have made this day possible.

It is a day in the best tradition of the generosity of the American people, and I rise to support the rule, as well as the underlying legislation.

□ 1715

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, said, "This \$15 billion bill is

about helping people: American farmers, American troops, storm victims here in the United States and in Central America; and Balkan refugees will all immediately benefit from passage of this essential aid package."

These are all laudable goals, and I support that. But I want to make the point that this \$15 billion emergency spending bill also creates an emergency for the most vulnerable people right here at home. For those who are hungry and homeless right here at home, this bill is a disaster.

What if the American people knew that, in order to fund these laudable goals and a bunch of other things in the bill, that we had to cut programs for the hungry and homeless and those who are in need of subsidized housing?

The bill cuts \$350 million from the Housing and Urban Development Section 8 housing program. The HUD says that the loss of this money could create the displacement of approximately 60,000 families right here at home.

We are worried, of course we are, about the displacement of people in Kosovo. We should be. But we also need to worry about the possible displacement of 60,000 families right here at home because of this. It creates a longer waiting list of people who need subsidized housing and increases the number of families in need who are underserved right here at home.

What if the American people knew that this bill cuts \$1.25 billion from the food stamp program? I am told that this money is not being spent. Does that mean that there are not hungry people right here? No.

In a 1999 survey of U.S. food banks, a report released in March by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), we discovered that 87 percent of the food banks surveyed indicated that requests were up in the last year. On average, requests for food assistance outstripped food available by 22 percent.

The Midwest Antihunger Network reports that, in Illinois, that there is a drop of 15 sponsors of the summer food service program in 1998. This is a nutrition program for low-income children in the summertime. These sponsors cited welfare reform cuts in meal disbursement rates that Congress instituted among the principal reasons. So there are going to be children this summer who do not have food programs. This is money that is being cut from the food stamp program in order to fund this.

What if the American people knew some of the things that were being funded in this program; that in this supplemental emergency bill, there is \$5 billion in defense spending above the President's request, \$26 million for Alaska fishermen to compensate for Federal fishing restrictions, \$3.7 million to renovate homes for congressional pages, \$3 million for commercial reindeer ranchers, \$2.2 million for sewers in Salt Lake City for the Olympics, \$30 million for renovations to D.C. area airports, \$422 million above the Presi-

dent's request for farmers crippled by low prices.

This is a piece of legislation that has many needed things and many things that we do not need and does create an emergency for our hungry and homeless people in need of housing and food right here at home.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as we watch the developing human catastrophe taking place in the Balkans on our television sets night after night, we must not forget that in our own hemisphere our neighbors in Central America have undergone a humanitarian crisis of their own, one caused by a hurricane which ravaged homes and wiped out entire communities.

More than 6 months after Hurricane Mitch swept through Central America, the region is still waiting for the much-needed funds to rebuild their infrastructure and to start healing the wounds that the hurricane left long after the rains and the floods have stopped.

But today we have an opportunity to end their suffering, to help revitalize the economies of our neighbors to the south, to give children back their schools, families back their homes and their churches, communities back their sense of normalcy. The funds are not a handout. They are a helping hand to those who have suffered almost insurmountable hardships.

My district in south Florida has experienced the disastrous effects of a hurricane. It is not an easy task to rebuild, even less so for those who have limited resources on hand. It is within our power and it is indeed our duty and responsibility as brothers and sisters in the greater hemispheric family to help them with this aid and to stop prolonging their suffering.

Supporting this measure is not only beneficial to Central America but to the greater economic stability and prosperity of our hemisphere.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) with this measure, Mr. Speaker, we are helping both American farmers and our American troops as well as storm victims here in the U.S. and in Central America. I urge my colleagues to adopt this measure today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this rule would authorize a resolution that asks for money to support an undeclared war. It would appropriate money for bombs, yet Congress has voted against the bombing. It appropriates money for ground troops, yet Congress opposes the use of troops in Kosovo.

It contains provisions that will enable the prosecution of a wide war

against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, even though Congress has expressly voted not to declare war. This war is without constitutional authorization, and it is losing its moral authority as well.

In the name of helping the refugees, NATO has bombed refugee convoys. From the Los Angeles Times a few days ago, I quote: "Many of the refugees in Korisa were asleep when explosions sprayed shrapnel and flames everywhere, survivors said. Mattresses left behind in covered wagons and in the dirt underneath were soaked with blood."

"At least a dozen children were among the dead. An infant buttoned up in terry cloth sleepers lay among the corpses that filled the local morgue."

"Another child was incinerated in a fire that swept through the camp. The child's carbonized body was still lying on the ground Friday morning beside that of an adult, in the middle of a tangle of farmers' tractors and wagons that were still burning 12 hours after the attack."

NATO and the United States have been bombing villages to save villages. NATO and this country have bombed passenger trains, buses, an embassy, factories, office buildings. Cluster bombs are raining down and maiming and killing countless children.

Today we are being asked to pay for the bills for this war. We ought to put a stop payment on the checks which will be used to kill innocent civilians and to wage an undeclared war. We ought to stop the bombing and negotiate a withdrawal of Serbian troops and stop the KLA's military activities.

We need an international peacekeeping force in Kosovo as a product of a peace agreement. We need to rebuild the province. Our government should work as vigorously for peace as it does to prosecute a war. This war is rapidly becoming a debacle that rivals Vietnam itself.

We need to stand up and speak out against this war and ask good thinking people everywhere to keep the consciousness of peace alive and keep working for peace. The people in the State Department ought to hear that message first.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, but in opposition to the emergency supplemental appropriation.

The President came to us and promised if we approved his plan for Bosnia that American participation in the operation would last a year and cost about \$1 billion. That was nearly 4 years ago and \$10 billion ago.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), who I often quote, has said that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again but expecting different results. Well, today we are being asked to drop more tax dollars down this bottomless pit. It

will lead to tens of billions of dollars more being similarly dumped into the Balkans.

Those voting for this bill should realize their fingerprints will be all over this ongoing and misguided commitment. Do not kid yourselves. In the end, tens of billions of dollars will be spent in the Balkans, and it will come right out of the hide of Social Security and Medicare reform, right out of any effort to modestly reduce the tax burden on our people, and right out of the hide of our military personnel who are being put at risk in other areas of the world where our national security interests are at stake, those military personnel who are currently being stretched to the point of exhaustion.

Perhaps the most distasteful part of what we are doing today is that, in order to get even limited help to our vulnerable defenders, we are being told that we must provide \$6 billion more for a military operation that is questionable at best.

Even the money that we originally voted for in this House that was supposed to be aimed at improving the overall plight of America's military we now find has been reduced to \$4.5 billion, which includes projects that have nothing to do with our national security or improving the lot of our troops and their families.

Military plus-up dollars will be spent, among other things, on naval bases in Portugal, barracks and tank washes in Germany, and base improvements throughout Europe. In other words, it is being spent to keep us mired in Europe's problems and paying for Europe's defense.

We have been suckered in again. For decades we have provided Europe's defense and got little thanks for it. Now that the Cold War is over, they insist that we spend tens of billions of dollars more for their stability and that we must reaffirm our commitment, a very expensive commitment to their security for decades to come.

We have done our part for NATO. We have done our part for Europe. Let us have the Europeans step forward and carry their own load rather than taking it out of the hide of the American people.

I have no doubt that the Serbs are committing the crimes against the people of Kosovo that are claimed. Long ago we should have armed freedom-loving and democracy-loving Kosovars so they can defend themselves as Ronald Reagan did with the Afghans.

Instead of giving into the demands of our European buddies, we are now carrying the full load. We have given into the demands of our European friends, and we end up carrying the full load, leading the fight, emptying our Treasury, and recklessly putting our own forces in other parts of the world in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues not to associate themselves with this irrational and risky strategy, this expen-

sive strategy that is draining our Treasury. Do not be blackmailed into supporting this poorly conceived Balkan operation, this undeclared war.

The issues of plussing up our military should be separate from this wasting of even more of limited defense dollars on such an adventure as we see down in the Balkans.

Vote against this emergency supplemental. Send a message to our European allies. We have carried their burden for too long. Yes, they deserve to be applauded for their emotional pleas that something must be done, but let them do it.

Why is it up to the United States to always lead the charge, to empty our Treasury, to put our people at risk? This is not a case of a dichotomy of either doing nothing and watching the Kosovars go under or sending our troops in and spending \$50 billion.

No, we could have helped the Kosovars, or the other option is let the Europeans take care of the problem in their own backyard. This is the responsible position. It is irresponsible for us to continue spending limited defense dollars, stretching our troops out to the point that they are vulnerable everywhere, and just taking it out of the hide of the American people. I ask for this emergency supplemental to be defeated.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, no bill is perfect, as we all know, but this bill is less than perfect. This House passed a much cleaner bill. Our colleagues in the Senate, although the Speaker and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittee chairman worked very hard to take out some of the pork and some of the riders, they did not.

□ 1730

And the facts are we have some environmental riders in this bill that are almost beyond our imagination that they are in the bill. There are three environmental riders, and I think it is important for our colleagues to know that they are in the bill.

One repeals the Mining Act of 1872 and effectively lets open-pit mines take their waste and put it on our Federal land. So we are talking about several hundred acres of pristine Federal land with toxic waste from open-pit mines. It is incredible, it is almost beyond the straight-face test that that is in fact what this legislation does. But that is exactly what this legislation does.

Another thing that it does is it stops hard mining regulations which would have required bonding for open-pit mines, so that when they do not clean up their mess, it cannot get cleaned up.

The third environmental rider deals with oil royalties. All of us know that this is going on. On Federal land there is a 12-percent royalty that is supposed to be paid. And what is being done is

there is a gaming of the system, that companies are charging their subsidiaries a price one-tenth of the actual price, eliminating 90 percent of the tax. In effect, we will be saving a hundred million dollars of their money but costing us a hundred million dollars of our money.

These riders ought to be taken out of the bill. We will have that opportunity in a motion to recommit later on this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, there are some things wrong with this bill, but there are other things that are rotten about this bill, under the cover of darkness, conferees, folks from the other chamber, are attempting to shove down our throats measures that would never pass the laugh test, the straight-face test, on the floor of this House.

Individuals have a thing called the gag reflex: When they put something down our throats, we can gag on it. And the House of Representatives ought to stand up and gag on these last-minute subterfuges to try to go backwards on the environment. And we will have our chance to do that.

I just wanted to alert other Members, this afternoon we will have a motion to recommit, to strip this bill of the environmental degradation that would go on with it, to make sure we can pass a clean bill. And we are going to do that 24 hours later after we pass this motion to recommit.

I want to say, if my colleagues go out and talk to their constituents about mining, and when they ask them do they think we should go forward on mining reform or backward, they will certainly say we should not go backward, we should go forward.

And on hard rock mining? On the Mining Act of 1872, these provisions do not take a small step backward, they take a giant leap backward. That is why we ought to recommit and pass a clean bill. I want to reiterate, this chamber and the other chamber can do that very quickly.

It would be a travesty for people, in their zeal to hand out special-interest favors against the environment, to take camouflage behind our troops in the field to try to pass this. That would indeed be a sad day in the House of Representatives.

Let us go forward on the environment, not backward. Let us go forward on mining reform, not backward. Let us stand up for people and the troops. Pass our motion to recommit, and then pass the clean bill 24 hours later.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule but in strong opposition to the supplemental appropriation.

The President came to us and asked us to fund the NATO war, asked for \$7.9 billion, but we in the conservative Congress have decided that not only would we give it to him, but we would bump that up to \$15 billion, which does not make a whole lot of sense, especially if Congress has spoken out on what they think of the war.

And Congress has. We have had several votes already. We have voted and said that we did not think that ground troops should be sent in. And most military people tell us that the only way we are going to win the war is with ground troops. So we have taken a strong position. We have had a chance to vote on declaration of war and make a decision one way or the other. We have strongly said we are not going to declare war.

We have spoken out on the air war. We did not even endorse the air war. And the President has spent a lot of money. They are hoping to get a lot of this money back from the European nations, but all that makes us are professional mercenaries fighting wars for other people, which I do not agree with.

But here we are getting ready to fund Europe, fund a war that is undeclared. It does not make any sense. We are giving more money to the President than he asked for in a war that cannot be won and a war that we are not even determined to fight. It just does not make any sense. So in order to get enough votes to pass the bill, of course we put a little bit of extras on there to satisfy some special interests in order to get some more votes.

But the real principle here today that we are voting on is whether or not we are going to fund an illegal, unconstitutional war. It does not follow the rules of our Constitution. It does not follow the rules of the United Nations Treaty. It does not follow the NATO Treaty. And here we are just permitting it, endorsing it but further funding it. This does not make any sense.

We have to finally say, "enough is enough." This is how we get into trouble. This is how we make mistakes. And every day we hear of another mistake and apologies being made, innocent people dying. We should not vote for this supplemental funding.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

It is a sad day when, regardless of our feelings about the tragedy in Latin America and the continuing carnage in the Balkans, that the price that we have to pay on the floor of this House is to inflict damage on the American taxpayer and the landscape.

There has been certain reference to the mining law of 1872, which has been an enormous waste of taxpayer dollars. Since that law was enacted, the United States Government has given away almost \$250 billion in mineral reserves.

In addition to robbing the Treasury, poorly managed mining operations have severely and permanently damaged public land. It is estimated the cost of cleaning up these polluted mines in the United States is between \$32 billion and \$72 billion, costs that will not be paid by those who profited from the mining operations.

Finally, the Department of the Interior, not the Members of Congress, are attempting to correct some of the flaws in the mining policy, as Interior recently has denied an application for mining operations in the State of Washington which sought to dump tons of toxic waste on public land. This denial relied on a previously unused section of the 1872 mining law and could be applied to mining operations across this country.

In addition, the Bureau of Land Management has been attempting for the past 3 years to promulgate new mining regulations that would address modern mining practices, impose meaningful environmental standards, and help protect taxpayers from the cost of cleaning up abandoned mines.

I am appalled that the legislation before us today to deal with disaster relief contains environmental riders which would prevent us from cleaning up mining in the United States. The first rider would permit the unsound mining practices to go forward not just in the State of Washington but allows similar practices throughout the United States until the end of the year. And for the third time in 3 years are riders included which delays implementation of the Bureau of Land Management's new mining regulations.

I strongly urge that we oppose this legislation and move to support the motion to recommit.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in ambivalence toward the rule but in strong opposition to the supplemental itself.

Because my dad used to have a saying, and that was that "the road to hell is paved with good intentions." And I think that that fairly well sums up this supplemental, because it may have the best of intentions in a whole lot of different areas within the government, but it is most certainly the road to hell in saving Social Security.

I mean, last fall we spent \$20 billion on an "emergency basis." Now we find ourselves about to spend another \$13 billion on this "emergency basis." That is \$33 billion sucked out of my kids' Social Security account. So I think we really are on the road to hell with these "emergency bills" because they are coming out of one pot and that is the Social Security pot.

Now, leaving aside the fact that it has got a lot of strange stuff in it, whether it is \$2.2 million for a sewer for the winter Olympics, \$3 million to redo dormitories, \$100,000 for a YMCA down in Southern California, \$330,000

for the minority leader and the majority whip, \$25,000 for the chief deputy whips to the Republican and Democrat parties, a lot of stuff that is by no means emergency.

What I think we need to take from this thing is a lesson; and that is, if this same \$33 billion was in individual accounts across this country, in individual Social Security accounts across this country, then Washington came up short for the YMCA down in Southern California, or who knows what, and wanted to take that money out of that account, I think people would go berserk.

I think we have really got to look at creating some kind of real firewall between people's Social Security money and political forces in D.C. Because, if not, we are going to continue to go the way these supplemental bills are going.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, certainly there are many sorry provisions in this conference report. It is hard to really concentrate on just one or two of them. But it seems to me the one that has gotten attention from several speakers because of its very adverse environmental consequences, the crown jewel open-pit gold mine, is appropriately placed in this bill.

The problem is that those who are supporting this conference report view the Social Security surplus as the crown jewel open-pit gold mine to fund whatever it is they want to fund. This bill has very little to do with busting Belgrade and a great deal to do with bursting the budget.

Keep in mind that well over \$10 billion in this proposal is paid for directly out of the Social Security surplus. This is the same surplus which the Republican leadership was planning to come to the floor this week and lock up in a lockbox. Well, they were ashamed to come out the same week that they are turning on the spigot on the Social Security surplus, because that is just exactly what is happening here when we drain out for short-term, allegedly emergency purposes the Social Security surplus to pay for things that ought not to be paid for by the next generation.

In this particular proposal that we are considering, the Republican Congressional Budget Office only within the last month told us what it would take to fund this war. They said \$600 million in the initial phase and about a billion dollars per month to sustain an air campaign. Supposedly in this emergency appropriation we would fund those appropriations necessary to carry us to September 30, when the regular appropriations bill would come into play.

How did that amount of money get blown into almost \$15 billion of money? In the way this Congress seems to operate, too often Republicans said that they did not like this war, they were proud to vote against the President on

this war. Well, I have to tell my colleagues, if these generous folks give this much to a war that they do not like, heaven protect the taxpayer from one that they do like.

I think that we do need to provide reasonable humanitarian relief, we need to provide our young men and women in the Balkans with whatever they need to protect themselves and to carry out their mission, whatever that may be. But let us be very clear that the billions of dollars that are the price tag of this bill do not have anything to do with securing our military position in Yugoslavia. They may have something to do with securing the position of some of the Members of this Congress.

Under the Republican leadership, this Congress in the last 4 years has voted to provide the Pentagon with \$27 billion more than it requested, and yet only 14 percent of those unrequested monies went for readiness rather than for pork. And so if there has been any emergency created here on readiness, it has been by the priorities of a Congress led by Republicans for the last 4 years.

I do not believe that the money provided to the military in this bill could be spent for purposes in Yugoslavia between now and September 30 if they were dropping it out in bails over Belgrade each night.

□ 1745

No, it funds things like libraries in Germany, a dormitory in the District of Columbia, a road in Bahrain, ATMs on ships, things that have nothing to do with the emergency situation we face in Yugoslavia, all designed to permit a raid on the Social Security surplus rather than to meet the legitimate needs of our military in the Balkans.

I believe that it was a former member of the Committee on Appropriations who said, "Every emergency is an opportunity." Certainly there are those who found great opportunity to deal with many other subjects here. But when all is said and done, it is the taxpayer who must pick up the tab, and in this case it is the Social Security surplus that must feel the pinch.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I support disaster relief for the people of Central America and the Caribbean. This assistance is long overdue. I support funding for our troops in Kosovo. I also support full funding for Census 2000. Nevertheless, I must oppose H.R. 1141, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999. This supplemental bill includes a \$1.25 billion cut in food stamp funding, a \$350 million cut in the Section 8 affordable housing program, and a \$22.4 million cut in unemployment insurance programs. These harmful cuts target the most vulnerable sections of our Na-

tion's population. And they will cause tremendous suffering to numerous low-income Americans. The food stamp cut in this bill is unprecedented and immoral. Excess funds provided to the food stamp program have always been used for other nutrition programs. They have never been transferred to nonnutrition programs. The proposed cut in food stamp funding would take away food from hungry people and set a dangerous precedent for using nutritional assistance as a budgetary offset.

I am also deeply concerned about the \$350 million cut in the Section 8 affordable housing program, which provides housing assistance to poor and elderly people, including many of our Nation's veterans. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, this rescission will result in a loss of subsidy for approximately 60,000 families and exacerbate the current waiting list problem on which many families must wait months or years to receive the housing assistance they so desperately need. The rescission could also disrupt the Section 8 program and cause many landlords to opt out of the program altogether.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, the President asked for \$7.2 billion for both of the supplementals. This is almost \$15 billion. Members have thrown in everything but the kitchen sink. The American taxpayers are tired of this kind of programming, this kind of legislating. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. We cannot move forward with this mess. It is outrageous and we should not want this on our records.

Mr. Speaker, I support disaster relief for the people of Central America and the Caribbean; this assistance is long overdue. I support funding for our troops in Kosovo. I also support full funding for Census 2000. Nevertheless, I must oppose H.R. 1141, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999.

This supplemental bill includes a \$1.25 billion cut in food stamp funding, a \$350 million cut in the Section 8 affordable housing program and a \$22.4 million cut in unemployment insurance programs. These harmful cuts target the most vulnerable segments of our nation's population, and they will cause tremendous suffering to numerous low-income Americans.

The food stamp cut in this bill is unprecedented and immoral. Excess funds provided to the food stamp program has always been used for other nutrition programs; they have never been transferred to non-nutrition programs. The proposed cut in food stamp funding would take food away from hungry people and set a dangerous precedent for using nutritional assistance as a budgetary offset.

I am also deeply concerned about the \$350 million cut in the Section 8 affordable housing program, which provides housing assistance to poor and elderly people, including many of our nation's veterans. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, this rescission will result in a loss of subsidy for approximately 60,000 families and exacerbate the current waiting list problem, on which many families must wait months or years to receive the housing assistance they so desperately need. The rescission could also disrupt the Section 8 program and cause many landlords to opt out of the program altogether.

Supporters of these rescissions claim that the funds being cut from housing assistance, food stamps and unemployment insurance will probably not be used during this fiscal year. If this is the case, the money can be rescinded at the end of the fiscal year or used to fund housing, nutrition and unemployment programs for fiscal year 2000.

We know there are unemployed, hungry and homeless people in America today who have been left behind despite recent economic growth. If the funds Congress has provided for these people are not reaching them, it stands to reason that we should improve the outreach of the programs, not cut their funding.

H.R. 1141 is supposed to be an emergency spending bill. Emergency spending bills are not subject to budgetary spending caps and should not require any offsets at all.

The Republicans have been blatantly inconsistent on the subject of offsets in emergency spending bills and they have needlessly politicized the appropriations process. First they included offsets in H.R. 1141, which was originally a bill to provide disaster relief to the victims of Hurricane Mitch in Central America and the Caribbean. Then they included billions of dollars in non-emergency defense spending but no offsets in H.R. 1664, the Kosovo supplemental bill. Now they have combined these two contradictory approaches and included a whole new set of offsets at the expense of the poorest people in America. If the Republicans would stop loading emergency spending bills with non-emergency projects, they would not need to worry about offsets.

I strongly support the extension of funding for the Commerce, State and Justice Departments and the federal court system through September 30, 1999, which is contained in this supplemental appropriations bill. Without this extension, the Commerce, State and Justice Departments and the federal court system could be shut down completely for the remainder of the fiscal year. However, if the Republican majority had fulfilled its responsibility to appropriate the funds that were necessary to operate these departments last year, the Republicans would not have needed to include this extension in an emergency spending bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act and oppose the disastrous offsets, which could cause tremendous harm to poor, hungry and unemployed people throughout the United States.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Congress has failed to authorize the ongoing war in Kosovo but the House and Senate Republican leaders are happy enough to see the President's \$7 billion request for emergency funding and raise him \$8 billion. That is right. \$15 billion of so-called emergency funding, every penny of which will come from the Social Security trust funds. \$15 billion in pork and special interest waivers under the guise of a military emergency in Kosovo. Something stinks. I guess that is why this bill includes \$2.2 million for sewers in Salt Lake City for the Olympics. That is an emergency. And a mining giveaway in Washington State. Waiver of

environmental laws. That is an emergency under this bill. Special breaks for oil and gas producers who just raised the price of gas 50 cents a gallon. That is an emergency. \$3.7 million for the page dorm. \$3 million for reindeer ranchers. \$23 million for fishers in Alaska. Hundreds of thousands for Democratic and Republican leaders. These are not emergencies. Say no to this legislation.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill, but I do so with great reluctance. I so very much wanted to vote for this emergency bill because just as it addresses an emergency situation in Kosovo and Central America, it also addresses an emergency situation for farmers all across this Nation. My reluctance is due to the fact that the bill contains vitally needed funding for domestic farm aid and I along with others from rural America have pleaded with Congress to provide these funds for months. This vitally needed farm aid is well overdue. The operating funds for the Farm Service Agency are vital and will help that agency to help farmers.

Mr. Speaker, small farmers are having a difficult time, struggling to survive in America. Most are losing money and fighting to stay in the farming business. In North Carolina, hogs, the State's top farm commodity, have experienced a 50 percent drop. Wheat is down 42 percent. Soybeans are down 36 percent. I can go on and on. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is no commodity that is making money for farmers in my State.

The conference report includes language that prohibits the Federal Government from using the tax settlement. That is important to my State. So it is with great reluctance that I oppose this conference report. Yet in spite of my reluctance, I am firm in my opposition. I am firm in my opposition to this conference report because it contains undue and unnecessary offsets. The offsets are undue because the funds being taken away are critically needed. The offsets are unnecessary because this is an emergency supplemental seeking to address true emergencies. Therefore, no offset is required. The offset is particularly onerous because it takes \$1.25 billion from food stamps. It takes food stamps. It takes funds from Section 8. You are taking from the poor to take care of the farmer. This is unnecessary. It is unworthy of us. I urge the defeat of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this bill, but I do so with great reluctance. I so very much wanted to vote for this emergency bill because just as it addresses an emergency situation in Kosovo and Central America, it also addresses an emergency situation with farmers all across this nation.

My reluctance is due to the fact that the bill contains vitally needed funding for domestic farm aid and I along with others from rural America have pleaded with Congress to provide these funds for months.

This vitally needed farm aid is well overdue. Included in the \$574 million in emergency agricultural assistance is \$109.6 million for FSA Loan Programs and \$42.75 million for FSA salaries and expenses. These loan funds are critically important to farmers who need capital just to stay in business.

And, the operating funds for the Farm Service Agency are vital and will help that Agency to help the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, small farmers are having a difficult time, struggling to survive in America.

Most are losing money and fighting to stay in the farming business.

In North Carolina, hogs, the state's top farm commodity, have experienced a fifty percent drop in prices since 1996.

Wheat is down forty-two percent; Soybeans down thirty-six percent; Corn—thirty-one percent; peanuts—twenty-eight percent.

Turkey and cotton prices are down twenty-three percent, since 1996.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, there is no commodity in North Carolina that makes money for farmers.

The conference report also includes language that prohibits the Federal Government from recovering part of the tobacco settlement reached by the states.

In addition, it includes language permitting the states to use this money, without restriction.

Those are important provisions for my state. So, it is with great reluctance that I oppose this conference report.

Yet, despite my reluctance, I am firm in my opposition.

I am firm in my opposition because the conference report contains undue and unnecessary offsets.

The offsets are undue because the funds being taken away as offsets are critically needed funds.

The offsets are unnecessary because this is an Emergency Supplemental, seeking to address true emergencies, and therefore, no offset is required.

The offsets are particularly onerous because they take \$1.25 billion from the Food Stamp Program.

By this deed, the report fails to recognize that hunger in America is more than just a word.

Many of our citizens, including many children, still live without proper nutrition and sufficient food.

The offsets also include \$350 million from the Section 8 Housing Program. And, in what seems to be a contradiction, the offsets include \$22.5 million from the Agricultural Research Service.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this conference report.

We can respond to emergencies, especially those of our farmers, without creating emergencies among our children and the poor.

We can provide food, shelter, hurricane and other aid to our friends abroad, as we should, without creating a storm here at home.

We can help those in Kosovo and Central America, as we should, without requiring an offset, because this is a true emergency.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time. It has been intimidating to the Members that the offsets in this bill are to take from the poor to give to, I presume, the rich. Let me just try to set the record straight here.

First of all, the offsets on the food stamps, the \$1.2 billion, was offered by the White House. So if Members have a problem with using the food stamps as an offset, they better call Mr. Lew down at the White House because they suggested these. By the way, these are surplus funds. On the issue of \$350 million for Section 8 housing, I would remind my colleagues that no one, and I repeat, no one has ever lost their housing or their housing voucher because of rescissions in Section 8. This is something that has happened each and every Congress. The money has always been restored. Are we going to have a problem? Is it going to be challenging? Absolutely. But we are committed to making sure that that Section 8 money is put back in. Let me just respond on this issue of the supplemental.

There are a lot of things in this supplemental to hate, there is no question. I think quite frankly the House did a far better job than the Senate. The Senate wanted to throw everything in but the kitchen sink. I suppose if the kitchen sink came from Alaska, it would be in here. But the fact of the matter is, we held them back and tried to keep this money in check and keep the spending responsible and in terms of emergencies.

I would conclude by saying if the President and the administration had taken care of the defense establishment of this country and funded each and every adventure that we are seeing around the globe over the past 6 or 7 years, we would not be at this point right now. Sure this is a supplemental and there are additional expenditures in here, but we tried very hard to keep this as small a dollar amount as we could, targeted at the war and at the other emergencies that we face.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency gets some additional funds. That is what this supplemental was meant to provide. There was an issue that was also raised about Federal Emergency Management funding going to Central America. Some people support that. Some do not. But the fact of the matter is, FEMA funds were for American emergencies, not Central American emergencies. But many of us felt that since these were serious, that people were damaged and harmed by this, that we would reach out to them. But those funds had to be offset under our rules. So we had to go out and find additional offsets. The White House offered the food stamps offsets. The Section 8 offsets will be put back in. We are committed to that.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly compliment the dedication of



the Committee on Appropriations in this body and the other to bringing forth legislation. But what troubles me is that this legislation has become a Trojan horse for many other unwarranted projects in an emergency spending bill. How can we justify the litany of projects that have been disclosed here this afternoon in an emergency bill, projects that ought to be funded in the normal appropriations process, projects which are essentially coming out of the Social Security trust fund. This is obscene. How do we explain to the seniors of this country or to the young people who are concerned about the Social Security program this abuse of the emergency supplemental process?

I would also like to emphasize that part of what is happening here is we are busting the budget caps. We have paid lip service to our commitment to observe these caps and balance the budget. But, in fact, what we are doing is we are shoe-horning into an emergency bill billions of dollars in spending that was otherwise expected to have to be calculated and fit into the normal process. This is an abuse of the budget process. This is Exhibit A of the need for budget reform in this Congress.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill today. Let us take a look at the emergencies this bill contains. Money for sewers. Money for dormitories. Money for fish in Alaska. Money for reindeer. I mean, is Santa in trouble? Is there some reindeer emergency that I am not aware of that requires millions of dollars? Or how about the extra money that goes to the minority leader and the majority whip? Is there some emergency going on in those offices that none of us are aware of that has not been reported in Roll Call?

Mr. Speaker, we should provide for our service men and women the resources they need. But the Department of Defense requested \$6 billion to fulfill its obligation. This bill doubles what the military experts said they needed. There is nearly \$2 billion for a military pay raise. Mr. Speaker, we need to address that issue, but not in an emergency spending bill. Some say, "Well, we offset this by \$2 billion." Yes, billions of dollars from food stamps. We can forget about reducing the national debt if we keep spending down the Social Security surplus with this kind of uncontrolled emergency spending.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience vote for an emergency spending bill loaded up with nonemergency spending provisions and unrelated environmental policy decisions.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, there are good riders and there are bad riders, and of course beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

These appropriation bills more often than not contain riders which seek to overturn rulemakings which seek to protect overall public interests. Those are bad riders. In the case of the pending legislation there are two riders concerning hard rock mining on Western public lands.

In the pending legislation there is, in effect, a provision which actually changes the operation of the Mining Law of 1872. This provision would waive mining law requirements as they relate to the amount of public land around mining claims that can be used to dispose of mining wastes. My colleagues from Florida and Washington have already spoken to this, and if they offer their motion to recommit, I will support it.

I can certainly understand they need to provide jobs by mining employment in the Western lands. I have a similar concern in my area where coal mining prevails in southern West Virginia. But the rider on this bill is not limited to one particular mine. This is no small issue. We are talking about sizable quantities of public land. What is particularly galling is that after years and years of resistance to negotiating any reforms to Mining Law of 1872, we are faced with a rider that is stuck deep in the bowels of this emergency appropriation bill that favors one company.

I urge recommitment.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the supplemental appropriations conference report and in support of the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE). The people of Oregon sent me 2,500 miles away to be careful with both their budget and with the environment. This bill is bloated on the budgetary side and is just flat wrong in the process and the substance of the decisions made in its environmental riders.

Mr. Speaker, substantive environmental legislation should not be passed in the dark of night. They deserve full review by this body and by the Senate, and, quite frankly, the substantive decision to open up mining in the Crown Jewel Mine is something that I do not believe my constituents or the people of America would support as an independent freestanding bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the motion to recommit submitted by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect bill. It certainly is a much better bill than passed this House last week by far. It

supports our troops in a very important way, a vital way. It helps with hurricane relief in the Caribbean and Central America. It helps tornado victims in Oklahoma and Kansas. It helps the refugees in the Balkans and hurting people as a result of the tremendous amount of oppression and genocide that is going on there.

The humanitarian aid has been increased 1 percent in this bill, mainly as a result of increases in food aid to the refugees for the next few months. It brings the total humanitarian package in this bill to 5 percent of the total package. This money is important and vital. I urge Members to support the conference committee.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, apparently there has been some discussion on the floor about environmental riders in this bill. We resisted some of those that were included in the Senate bill. We tried to have a balanced bill.

On the case of the finalizing of hard rock mining regulations, the facts are that there is a National Academy of Sciences, which is an independent agency, doing a study to give us an analysis of the provisions that are being proposed in these regulations. This report is due out by July 31, and there is a 120-day comment period thereafter.

So what we are really saying in this bill is give us time to get the report from the National Academy of Sciences, give the people, both sides, time to comment, which is also provided in that arrangement, and then we will decide what the national policy should be. And all this bill does is to put a moratorium on until such time as we get that information.

On the Crown Jewel Mine issue, again this is retroactive. The Crown Jewel Mine is a mining company that has crossed every T, dotted every I, has had all the permits issued by the Federal and the State government. They are ready to go forward.

It was pointed out in the debate on the supplemental that several State retirement systems and State governmental agencies had invested in this mine, and if it were not allowed to go forward, there would be a total loss of money to these retirement systems. So my colleagues are talking about taking money away from public retirement programs if they were to allow this Crown Jewel Mine to be shut down.

Now it is not as if this was prospective. This mine has been okayed by everybody, had a NEPA statement filed, done everything required by the law of both the State of Washington as well as the Federal Government, and all we

have said in this bill is they can go forward so that these large groups of investors, such as the retirement systems, do not suffer huge losses and because it is the right thing to do. They have done everything required by law.

That is an issue that this Congress will have to address. Whether or not we choose to preclude mining in the United States in the future is a policy issue that will continue to be before this body in the future. But at least in fairness we should not legislate retroactively, and that is what has been attempted by the Solicitor's opinion. We are simply putting a stay on that so that those companies that have abided by the law in every way, have made huge investments, \$80 million investments provided by funds from the groups that I mentioned, are allowed to continue operating.

So I think these are responsible amendments. We did have some that were anti-environment, and we did not approve those. There were amendments from the other body that were denied in the conference because they were not constructive environmental actions.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it, and I appreciate the gentleman putting the best spin possible on these riders. But I would still, as my colleagues know, mention to the gentleman that the Solicitor's opinion would prevent these open pit mines from putting toxic waste on our lands, on Federal lands, and by the rider that we have put in the bill, which I am sure it was not at the gentleman's initiative that it was put in the bill, it would exactly do that. It would allow hundreds of acres of pristine Federal lands to be stacked up with waste product, toxic waste product. I mean it is beyond comprehension that we are allowing that to happen.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled as to why the Environmental Protection Agency of this administration would approve it under the circumstances the gentleman from Florida has just outlined.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I mean he is legislating. That overrides every other piece of legislation that exists that specifically allows that to occur.

Mr. REGULA. Now wait a minute. The mining law provides for regulation. This is rather ironic. This administration has been opposed to the 1872 Mining Act, and yet they found an obscure provision in that particular act that the Solicitor used to make his opinion valid. He used the mining law to bring this about.

But the point is that all the agencies of this administration had okayed it, and if we think it is wrong, we ought to change the law. We should not allow a company to invest \$80 million of inves-

tors' money and then change the rules. They should not be required to suffer a huge loss because of this obscure provision that is being interpreted. A Solicitor's opinion is not law, and I think if we just tried to deal with this single issue problem, if it is wrong, we should have a bill put in here and amend the law.

Mr. DEUTSCH. If the gentleman would continue to yield, again I think if our concern is the teachers' unions, there will be a lot better ways, and I think the teachers of America and the children of America and the American people would be a lot happier dealing with that investment a different way.

I mean we are talking about hundreds of acres of land that you and I own as American citizens, pristine national forest areas.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I do not know, and I have not been out there so I have not looked at it, and I do not know all the nuances of the law. I just know that the agencies of this administration approved it, told them to go ahead and make the investment. They did everything required by the laws of the United States and the State of Washington, and what more can we ask of a company? And again, if we think this is wrong, we have a responsibility to deal with it in a policy decision in this body.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for taking this action because let us put this into perspective. This was a mine in north central Washington that had invested some \$80 million with the full expectation that, if they followed the rules as was laid out in current law, that they would be able to mine for this gold. They passed every hoop that the State of Washington put, every barrier the State of Washington put up, everything that the Federal Government put up, and they passed it until it got here and the Solicitor simply said, "I'm sorry."

What happened was that the Solicitor said, "I'm sorry, we're going to take a provision that had never been enforced, never been enforced in the 1872 Mining Law," and said for that reason we are going to completely shut down this mine, again, after it had gone through all the barriers that were required under current law.

Now I might add it does have an effect, as the gentleman mentioned, on retirement funds, but also it has an impact on employment of about 150 to 200 people in a county frankly that is crying for more employment. So in fairness is the real reason why this provision was put into law, because it deals with this specific mine and mines that are in existence already, that were playing by the rules that we thought they should be playing by when they started their endeavor and made that investment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for the work he did on that because I think he did the right thing.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, if I have any time, I would just say that the provision that was put in by the other body was very sweeping. The House conferees narrowed it, and got it very narrow in its application.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, some of us have our differences with this bill, including myself. As my colleagues know, the Senate added pork, no question, everything but the kitchen sink, and it is certainly not emergencies. But everyone needs to support this rule so we can have an open and honest debate on the floor during the general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1815

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and I think it is important for us to get back to the reason that we are here right now. We are going to be, once we pass this measure, discussing a \$15 billion emergency supplemental appropriations bill, which is absolutely necessary to offset the very significant costs of the Kosovo campaign, as well as to provide emergency aid to America's farmers, disaster victims here in the United States and Central America and to Balkan refugees.

Now I would like to compliment the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and specifically our great Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who did a superb job facing much adversity, and I can say I was in on a number of these meetings over the past several weeks on this issue and it has been a challenging time but both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) have done an absolutely superb job.

As my friend, the gentlewoman from Charlotte, North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) just said, it is true our colleagues in the other body have clearly added many things to this measure which should not be there, but this conference report takes a very important first step towards reversing that very dangerous 10-year path that we have had of diminishing the capability of our Nation's defenses.

With the ongoing missions that are taking place, both in Kosovo, Korea and Iraq, our forces are being asked to do much more with much less. The bill puts \$2.65 billion directly into the pipeline for spare parts, readiness, depot maintenance and recruitment.

Along with many others, many others in this House and around this country, I have had serious doubts as to the



effectiveness of our air-only campaign. Whatever the arguments for U.S. involvement in Kosovo were, it is now a very clear national interest that both the United States of America and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization alliance prevail in this conflict. The price of NATO and American failure is simply too great at this point.

Therefore, I urge support of both this rule, which is the standard rule waiving points of order against the conference report, and we will have a full hour of debate led by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I think at the end of the day we should have a very strong bipartisan vote for this.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 315, nays 109, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—315

Abercrombie	Bryant	Dunn
Ackerman	Burr	Edwards
Aderholt	Burton	Ehlers
Allen	Buyer	Ehrlich
Andrews	Callahan	Emerson
Archer	Calvert	Engel
Armey	Camp	English
Bachus	Campbell	Etheridge
Baird	Canady	Everett
Baker	Cannon	Ewing
Baldacci	Capps	Farr
Ballenger	Cardin	Fletcher
Barcia	Castle	Foley
Barr	Chabot	Forbes
Barrett (NE)	Chambliss	Ford
Bartlett	Chenoweth	Fossella
Barton	Clement	Fowler
Bass	Coble	Franks (NJ)
Bateman	Coburn	Frelinghuysen
Bentsen	Collins	Frost
Bereuter	Combest	Gallegly
Berkley	Cook	Ganske
Berry	Cooksey	Gekas
Biggert	Cox	Gibbons
Bilbray	Cramer	Gilchrest
Bilirakis	Crane	Gillmor
Bishop	Cubin	Gilman
Blagojevich	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Bliley	Davis (FL)	Goode
Blumenauer	Davis (VA)	Goodlatte
Blunt	Deal	Goodling
Boehlert	DeLay	Gordon
Boehner	DeMint	Goss
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Bonior	Dickey	Granger
Bono	Dicks	Green (TX)
Boswell	Dingell	Green (WI)
Boucher	Dooley	Greenwood
Boyd	Doolittle	Gutknecht
Brady (TX)	Dreier	Hall (OH)
Brown (FL)	Duncan	Hall (TX)

Hansen	McHugh	Scarborough
Hastings (WA)	McInnis	Schaffer
Hayes	McIntosh	Scott
Hayworth	McKeon	Sensenbrenner
Hefley	Menendez	Shadeegg
Herger	Metcalfe	Shaw
Hill (MT)	Mica	Shays
Hilleary	Miller (FL)	Sherwood
Hinchey	Miller, Gary	Shimkus
Hinojosa	Minge	Shows
Hobson	Moakley	Shuster
Hoefel	Mollohan	Simpson
Hoekstra	Moore	Sisisky
Holden	Moran (KS)	Skeen
Horn	Moran (VA)	Skelton
Hostettler	Morella	Smith (MI)
Houghton	Murtha	Smith (NJ)
Hoyer	Myrick	Smith (TX)
Hulshof	Nethercutt	Smith (WA)
Hunter	Ney	Snyder
Hutchinson	Northup	Souder
Hyde	Norwood	Spence
Isakson	Nussle	Spratt
Istook	Obey	Stearns
Jenkins	Olver	Stenholm
John	Ortiz	Stump
Johnson (CT)	Ose	Sununu
Johnson, E. B.	Oxley	Sweeney
Johnson, Sam	Packard	Talent
Jones (NC)	Paul	Tancredo
Kasich	Pease	Tanner
Kelly	Pelosi	Tauscher
Kildee	Peterson (PA)	Tauzin
King (NY)	Petri	Taylor (MS)
Kingston	Pickering	Taylor (NC)
Knollenberg	Pickett	Terry
Kolbe	Pitts	Thomas
Kuykendall	Pombo	Thornberry
LaHood	Pomeroy	Thune
Lampson	Porter	Tiahrt
Lantos	Portman	Toomey
Largent	Price (NC)	Trafigant
Larson	Pryce (OH)	Turner
Latham	Radanovich	Udall (CO)
LaTourette	Ramstad	Udall (NM)
Lazio	Regula	Upton
Leach	Reyes	Velazquez
Levin	Reynolds	Walden
Lewis (CA)	Riley	Walsh
Lewis (GA)	Rivers	Wamp
Lewis (KY)	Roemer	Watkins
Linder	Rogan	Watt (NC)
LoBiondo	Rogers	Watts (OK)
Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Weldon (FL)
Lowey	Ros-Lehtinen	Weller
Lucas (KY)	Roukema	Wexler
Lucas (OK)	Royce	Whitfield
Maloney (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
Manzullo	Ryun (KS)	Wilson
Matsui	Sabo	Wise
McCarthy (MO)	Salmon	Wolf
McCarthy (NY)	Sandlin	Wynn
McCollum	Sanford	Young (AK)
McCrery	Saxton	Young (FL)

NAYS—109

Baldwin	Hill (IN)	Meeks (NY)
Barrett (WI)	Hilliard	Millender
Becerra	Holt	McDonald
Berman	Hooley	Miller, George
Brown (OH)	Inslee	Mink
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Nadler
Carson	Jackson-Lee	Napolitano
Clay	(TX)	Neal
Clayton	Jefferson	Oberstar
Clyburn	Jones (OH)	Owens
Conyers	Kanjorski	Pallone
Costello	Kaptur	Pascarell
Coyne	Kennedy	Pastor
Crowley	Kilpatrick	Payne
Cummings	Kind (WI)	Peterson (MN)
Danner	Klecza	Phelps
Davis (IL)	Klink	Rahall
DeFazio	Kucinich	Rangel
DeGette	LaFalce	Rodriguez
Delahunt	Lee	Rothman
DeLauro	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Deutsch	Luther	Rush
Dixon	Maloney (CT)	Sanchez
Doggett	Markey	Sanders
Doyle	Martinez	Sawyer
Esho	Mascara	Schakowsky
Evans	McDermott	Sherman
Fattah	McGovern	Slaughter
Finler	McIntyre	Stabenow
Frank (MA)	McKinney	Stark
Gedensson	McNulty	Strickland
Gephardt	Meehan	Stupak
Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)	Vento	Weiner
Thurman	Visclosky	Weygand
Tierney	Waters	Woolsey
Towns	Waxman	Wu

NOT VOTING—9

Borski	Condit	Serrano
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Seillions
Brown (CA)	Quinn	Weldon (PA)

□ 1837

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SCHAFFER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RULES OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT FOR THE 106TH CONGRESS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (as contemplated by clause 2(a)2 of rule XI) of the rules adopted by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct pursuant to clause 2(a)1 of rule XI, which have duly governed the proceedings of the Committee since their adoption on January 20, 1999, and subsequent amendment on March 10, 1999 and on April 14, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

### RULES: COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

#### FOREWORD

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is unique in the House of Representatives. Consistent with the duty to carry out its advisory and enforcement responsibilities in an impartial manner, the Committee is the only standing committee of the House of Representatives the membership of which is divided evenly by party. These rules are intended to provide a fair procedural framework for the conduct of the Committee's activities and to help insure that the Committee serves well the people of the United States, the House of Representatives, and the Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives.

#### PART I—GENERAL COMMITTEE RULES

##### Rule 1. General Provisions

(a) So far as applicable, these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the Committee and any subcommittee. The Committee adopts these rules under the authority of clause 2(a)1 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 106th Congress.

(b) The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) When the interests of justice so require, the Committee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt any special procedures, not inconsistent with these rules, deemed necessary to resolve a particular matter before it. Copies of such special procedures shall be furnished to all parties in the matter.

##### Rule 2. Definitions

(a) "Committee" means the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.